## D. REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 remain pending herein.

Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 18 have been canceled herein.

The examiner has rejected claims 1- 24 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore et al (Moore) US 2001/0039546A1. With respect to independent claims 1, 10, 15, 21, 23, 24 and each dependent claim therefrom, Moore does not teach enabling a subsequent rendering of the stored multimedia objects or transient messages in succession in response to a user selection of a control button associated with the list of stored multimedia objects. Moore appears to be silent on the playing back of the stored objects other than discussed in paragraph [0053] and stating generally that the objects are stored for later perusal [0037]. Moore appears to also teach away from the claim element of storing each multimedia object in a chronological list by stating at [0044] that if the object had previously been captured, the existing object record is updated. As such, the new captured object would not be stored chronologically, but would have merely updated a previously stored object.

The examiner's comments with respect to claims 6, 12, 18, the features of which are now incorporated into claims 1, 10, 15 and other independent claims as amended herein, are not well founded. Applicants could find no teaching in Moore at paragraphs [0021] or [0022] or elsewhere of enabling a subsequent rendering of the stored multimedia objects in succession in response to a user selection of a control button associated with the list of the stored multimedia objects.

AUS920010005US1

09/843,059

With respect to claim 7, contrary to the examiner's position, Applicants could find no teaching in Moore that the storing step occurs for a configurable duration of time.

With respect to claim 8, claim 8 has been amended to claim a chronological list which is not taught by Moore. In contrast, Moore appears to teach away from this by stating at [0044] that if the object had previously been captured, the existing object record is updated. As such, the new captured object would not be stored chronologically, but would have merely updated a previously stored object.

All of the currently pending claims are deemed to be patentable for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Smith Dawkins Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 31,140

(512) 823-0094

**2Eb 0 8 5003** 

OEMLEVE EVX COMLE RECEIVED

AUS920010005US1

12 OFFICIAL